



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
09/198,590	11/23/98	CHANDRUPATLA	S CISCO-0610

DAVID B RITCHIE
D'ALESSANDRO & RITCHIE
PO BOX 640640
SAN JOSE CA 95164-0640

LM02/1112

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, N

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2764

DATE MAILED:

11/12/99

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Office Action Summary

Application No.
09/198,590

Applicant(s)

Chandrupatia et al.

Examiner
Nga B. Nguyen

Group Art Unit
2764



☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on Nov 23, 1998

☐ This action is **FINAL**.

☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, **prosecution as to the merits is closed** in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 35 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire three month(s), or thirty days, whichever is longer, from the mailing date of this communication. Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. (35 U.S.C. § 133). Extensions of time may be obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Disposition of Claim

☒ Claim(s) 1-25 is/are pending in the application.

Of the above, claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

☒ Claim(s) 1-25 is/are rejected.

☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

Application Papers

☒ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.

☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on _____ is ☐ approved ☐ disapproved.

☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).

☐ All ☐ Some* ☒ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been

☐ received.

☐ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) _____.

☐ received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

*Certified copies not received: _____

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

Attachment(s)

☒ Notice of References Cited, PTO-892

☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). 4, 5

☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413

☒ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948

☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152

— SEE OFFICE ACTION ON THE FOLLOWING PAGES —

Art Unit: 2764

DETAILED ACTION

1. This Office Action is the answer to the communication filed on November 23, 1998 , which paper has been placed of record in the file.
2. Claims 1-25 are pending in this application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371© of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

4. Claims 1-6 and 9-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Reeder, U.S. Patent No. 5,852,812.

Regarding claim 1, Reeder discloses a method for accounting for network usage comprising (see figures 3, 5, 7, 9 and column 7, line 45-column 12, line 36):

obtaining accounting start-stop event data from an accounting server;

obtaining network flow data from a router within a network through an intermediary netflow collector; and

Art Unit: 2764

correlating accounting start-stop event data and network flow data into a subscriber specific call detail record.

Regarding claim 2, Reeder discloses the steps of:

parsing accounting start-stop event data from accounting sever on a prescribed time interval (column 10, lines 30-65); and

publishing accounting start-stop event data on an information bus (column 12, lines 12-36).

Regarding claim 3, Reeder discloses collecting accounting start-stop event data at a target device that subscribes to accounting start-stop event data (column 9, lines 55-column 10, line 22).

Claim 4 contains the same limitation of claims 2 and 3, therefore is rejected by the same rationale.

Regarding claim 5, Reeder discloses aggregating network flow data at network flow collector according to a service provider defined aggregation scheme (column 6, line 19-column 7, line 25) .

Regarding claim 6, Reeder discloses aggregating network flow data further comprises: basing aggregation of network flow data on a specified time period (column 11, lines 45-60).

Regarding claim 9, Reeder discloses filtering network flow data at network flow collector according to a service provider defined filtration scheme (column 11, lines 45-60).

Regarding claim 10, Reeder discloses the method further comprises the steps of:

Art Unit: 2764

collecting network flow data from a router and forwarding network flow data to network flow collector (column 6, lines 45-57);

aggregating network flow data according to a defined aggregation scheme (column 6, line 19-column 7, line 25);

parsing network flow data from network flow collector (column 10, lines 30-65);

publishing network flow data on an information bus (column 6, lines 58-65).

Regarding claim 11, Reeder discloses filtering network flow data according to a service provider defined filtration scheme (column 11, lines 45-60).

Regarding claim 12, Reeder disclose reformatting call detail record to meet post-correlated applications (column 7, lines 25-35).

Regarding claim 13, Reeder discloses a method for accounting for network usage comprising:

parsing accounting start-stop event data from an accounting server on prescribed time interval (column 10, lines 30-65 and column 11, lines 45-60);

publishing accounting start-stop event data on an information bus (column 6, lines 58-65);

collecting network flow data from a network router and forwarding network flow data to a network flow collector (column 6, lines 45-57);

aggregating network flow data according to a prescribed aggregation scheme (column 6, line 19-column 7, line 25);

Art Unit: 2764

parsing network flow data from network flow collector (column 12, line 60-column 13, line 62);

publishing network flow data on an information bus (column 12, lines 12-36);

collecting accounting start-stop event data and network flow data at a target device that subscribes to accounting start-stop event data and network flow data; and

correlating accounting start-stop event data and network flow data into a subscriber specific call detail record.

Regarding claim 14, Reeder discloses a method for aggregating accounting start-stop event data and network flow data within a computer network comprising (see figures 3, 5, 7, 9 and column 7, line 45-column 12, line 36):

obtaining accounting start-stop event data from an accounting server;

obtaining network flow data from a router within a network through an intermediary netflow collector; and

correlating accounting start-stop event data and network flow data into a subscriber specific call detail record.

Claim 15 is written in means and contains the same limitations as claim 1, therefore is rejected by the same rationale.

Claim 16 is written in means and contains the same limitations as claim 13, therefore is rejected by the same rationale.

Art Unit: 2764

Claim 17 is written in means and contains the same limitations as claim 14, therefore is rejected by the same rationale.

Regarding claim 18, Reeder discloses an apparatus for accounting for network usage (see figures 1-4), comprising:

- an accounting adapter in communication with accounting start-stop event data;
- a network flow adapter in communication with network flow data; and
- an integrating accounting adapter in communication with accounting adapter and network flow adapter which correlates accounting start-stop event data and network flow data into a subscriber specific call detail record.

Regarding claim 19, Reeder discloses accounting adapter further comprises:

- a parser in communication with an accounting server storing accounting start-stop event data (column 10, lines 30-36); and a publisher in communication with an information bus (column 7, lines 7-40).

Regarding claim 20, Reeder discloses network flow adapter further comprises: a parser in communication with a network router storing network flow data; an aggregator that assembles network flow data according to an aggregation scheme; and a publisher in communication with an information bus (column 6, line 20-column 7, line 40).

Regarding claim 21, Reeder discloses integrating accounting adapter further comprises:

- a correlator that assembles accounting start-stop event data and network flow data into a call detail record (column 12, line 60-column 13, line 62); and

Art Unit: 2764

a reformattor in communication with a post processing application device that reformats the data according to service provider requirements (column 7, lines 27-34).

Regarding claim 22, Reeder discloses an apparatus for aggregating accounting for network usage comprising (see figures 1-4):

an accounting adapter in communication with accounting start-stop event data;

a network flow adapter in communication with network flow data; and

an integrating accounting adapter in communication with accounting adapter and network flow adapter which correlates accounting start-stop event data and network flow data into a subscriber specific call detail record.

Claim 23 is written in application software and contains the same limitations as claim 1, therefore are rejected by the same rationale.

Claim 24 is written in application software and contains the same limitations as claim 24, therefore are rejected by the same rationale.

Regarding claim 25, Reeder discloses a communication system for aggregating accounting start-stop event data and network flow data within a computer network comprising (see figures 1-4):

a plurality of hosts that are provided computer networking capability through a point of presence;

a network access server in communication with hosts;

an accounting server in communication with network access server;

Art Unit: 2764

accounting adapter in communication with accounting server;
a network flow collector in communication with routers throughout the computer network;
a network flow adapter in communication with netflow collector; and
an integrating accounting adapter in communication with accounting adapter and network flow adapter.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 7-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Reeder, U.S. Patent No. 5,852,812 in view of McCreery et al, U.S. Patent No. 5,787,253.

Regarding claims 7-8, Reeder does not teach the step of: basing aggregation of network flow data on the Internet Protocol Layer 3 and Internet Protocol Layer 4. McCreery et al teach the step of: basing aggregation of network flow data on the Internet Protocol Layer 3 and Internet Protocol Layer 4 (see abstract). It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine McCreery's step of basing aggregation of network flow data on the Internet Protocol Layer 3 and Internet Protocol Layer 4 for the purpose

Art Unit: 2764

of using Internet Protocol Layer 3 or Internet Protocol Layer 4 to aggregate of network flow data.

Conclusion

7. Claims **1-25** are rejected.

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to examiner Nga B. Nguyen, whose telephone number is (703)306-2901. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 7:30 AM-5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, James P. Trammell, can be reached on (703)305-9768.

9. **Any response to this action should be mail to:**

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks
c/o Technology Center 2700
Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to:

(703) 308-9051, (for formal communications intended for entry)

or:

(703) 308-5397 (for informal or draft communications, please label
"PROPOSED" or "DRAFT")

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II,


Art Unit: 2764

2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington.

VA., Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703)305-3900.

Nga B. Nguyen
November 2, 1999



James P. Harnall
Supervisory Patent Examiner
Technology Center 2700